

**Remarks/Arguments:**

This is a reply to the office action of March 31, 2005.

The Examiner maintains that the subject-matter of claims 1 to 20 is anticipated by the disclosure of Kara (US-5510992). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 13 require, *inter alia*, the displaying of a depiction of a postage indicium to be printed on a mail item, which includes a plurality of data items which are modifiable by a user, and more particularly provides for the selection of any one of the data items from within the depicted postage indicium, in particular by a screen pointing device, such as a mouse, a tracker ball, a touch pad or a touch screen.

In the system and method of Kara, the Examiner apparently considers the meter display 601, the print button 607, the destination button 608 and the class button 609 to define together the postage indicium of the claimed invention.

It is submitted that this is manifestly not the case. For example, the print button 607 would never be printed on a mail item, but rather is the means by which a postage indicium is printed on a mail item.

Furthermore, the system and method of Kara do not include any means by which data items can be selected from within a depicted postage indicium. In marked contrast, in the system and method of Kara, the destination and postage class, for example, can only be selected by selecting one of the corresponding buttons 608, 609, which do not form part of a depicted postage indicium.

Accordingly, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, it is submitted that the subject matter of claims 1 and 13 is clearly distinguished from the disclosure of Kara and not

anticipated by the same.

The Examiner is alleging that the subject matter of claims 21 to 32 is anticipated by the disclosure of Gil (US-4868757). This is not the case.

Claims 21 and 27 require *inter alia* the transmission of messages relating to batches of mail to a remote data center, the receipt of messages from the remote data center as an acknowledgment in reply to each transmitted message, and the displaying of message areas corresponding to each transmitted message, where the message areas have a first visual appearance on transmission of the respective messages to the remote data center and a second, different visual appearance on receipt of the respective messages from the remote data center.

None of these features of the claimed invention can be found in Gil. It is noted that Gil does disclose that a post office computer can be connected to the post office control unit 13 to enable communication with the EAROMS 57, 58 (column 7, line 64 to column 8, line 2), but there is no suggestion of the transmission of messages relating to batches of mail to a remote data center or the receipt of messages from the remote data center as an acknowledgment in reply to each transmitted message, in the manner as required by the claimed invention. Furthermore, there is no suggestion of the displaying of message areas corresponding to each transmitted message, and certainly not that the message areas have a first visual appearance on transmission of the respective messages to the remote data center and a second, different visual appearance on receipt of the respective messages from the remote data center.

Accordingly, we submit that claims 21 and 27 of the instant application clearly distinguish the invention from the disclosure of Gil, and are not anticipated by Gil, and that this application is in condition for allowance.

A petition for an extension of time accompanies this paper.

Respectfully,

*Charles Fallow*

---

Charles W. Fallow  
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.  
10 Post Office Road  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
(301) 589-8900

September 30, 2005